

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,606	01/12/2001		Gero Offer	12758-002001/2000P01017	9443
26161	7590	11/17/2004		EXAMINER	
	CHARDSON	N PC	D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M		
225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,				2683	
•			DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	10
Advisory Action	09/759,606	OFFER, GERO	\forall
navisory nousin	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the same of this application at the same of the sam	ation. A proper reply to a	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. RE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensi unt of the fee. The appropriate extens originally set in the final Office action;	ion sion
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	·	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d) (d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendmen	t
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the amendments do not overcome the examiner's prior art rejection. The prior art, when combined, clearly discloses systems that provide means for connecting a wireless device/phone to a vending machine. Hence the examiner disagrees with the applicant's characterization that the prior art does not "suggests ttenabling the vending machine to dispense the product in connection with the use of the cellular telephone," as described in Applicant's claim 1 Secondly, the examiner disagrees with the applicant's characterization that a cash register does not dispense anything, quite to the contrary, it dispenses money. Also, the other prior art listed disloses the concept of vending machines. The applicant also argues the examiner's interpretation of wireless communications - the examiner gives broad interpretation to all claims presented and interprets the prior art used as reading on RF/cellular communications. Lastly, the applicant argues that the additional prior art (ie. Morril, Martineau, Kawan, Griffith) do not remedy the short-comings of Miller - the examiner disagrees since the specific portions cited from the listed prior art combines to read on the applicant's claims in the examiner's opinion and therefore they are not novel. Examiner's note: The examine believes the prior art to fully read on the independent claims while the dependent claims do not add enough detail for the examiner to interpret one/any as being objectable material.

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600